DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 700 CS 012 258

AUTHOR	Lore, Rosemary; Chamberlain, Edward
TITLE	Language Development Component Chapter 1 Reading Program 1993-94. Final Evaluation Report. Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1.
INSTITUTION	Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	51p.; For 1992-93 report, see ED 375 375.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *High Risk Students; *Instructional Effectiveness; Language Acquisition; Outcome Based Education; Program Effectiveness; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading; Urban Education; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

A study evaluated the Chapter 1 Reading Program that served 5,946 underachieving pupils in grades 1 through 8 in the Columbus, Ohio, public schools. These children appeared unlikely to learn to read successfully without additional reading instruction. The program featured small group instruction each day for 40-45 minutes on reading and writing activities. The program provided service to 86 public elementary schools, 26 public middle schools, and 11 nonpublic schools. A major part of the evaluation effort was accomplished through the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Results indicated that (1) 84.7% of a treatment group of 4,506 pupils displayed over time each of 3 strategic processing behaviors (constructing meaning, monitoring reading, and integrating sources of information; (2) of the 4,506 treatment group pupils with available retention data, 4,133 (91.7%) were promoted; (3) 4,224 (91.1%) of a treatment group of 4637 pupils read 5 or more books at level 8 or above; (4) for an evaluation sample of 3,708 pupils, the average normal curve equivalent (NCE) change across grades was 2.6 NCEs in Total Reading; and (5) 4,592 pupils had one or more parents who participated in parent involvement activities. Findings suggest continuation of the program with consideration given to 5 areas of concern. (Contains nine tables. Appendixes present three tables of data and evaluation instruments.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 386 700

Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM

1993-94

Written by:

Rosemary Lore and Edward Chamberlain,
Professional Specialists

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G) Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Data Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

CS012258

The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex or handicap with regard to admission, access, treatment or employment. This policy is applicable in all district programs and activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM
1993-94

Abstract

Program Description: The Chapter 1 Reading Program served 5946 pupils. Funding of the component was made available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1 of Title I of 1965, reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendment of 1988.

The purpose of the Chapter 1 Reading Program was to provide assistance to selected underachieving pupils in grades 1 through 8 in order that they might attain more fully their potential by improving their language and reading skills. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs, as determined by continued cooperation between the program teacher and the classroom teacher. Inservice sessions were provided for various subgroups of program teachers.

The program provided service to 86 public elementary schools, 26 public middle schools, and 11 nonpublic schools. Because public school program teachers were funded 90% by Chapter 1 funds and 10% by the school district's general fund, they were called Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers. Several different service patterns were devised in order to schedule Chapter 1 instruction for 90% of the teacher's time. Program teachers in the nonpublic schools served as full-time Chapter 1 teachers.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the program started on September 20, 1993, for all grades. For evaluation based on standardized test data (needed for Federal and State Guidelines) the time interval ended March 18, 1994. This provided a maximum of 105 days for pupils in grades 1-8. An additional 29 school days (through May 6, 1994) were included in the time interval for evaluating Desired Outcomes not based on standardized test data. Each Desired Outcome had a pupil attendance criterion of attending 50 percent of scheduled program days for inclusion in the sample or treatment group.

Activities: Program teachers provided small group instruction to strengthen pupils' reading skills. Consultation with classroom teachers and parents was emphasized in order to provide for individual pupil needs.

Desired Outcomes: Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 1-8) in the treatment period (those who met the attendance criterion or were discontinued and were English-speaking) will display evidence of each strategic processing behavior at least once during the treatment period when reading appropriate instructional text to the satisfaction of the Chapter 1 teacher. Desired Outcome 2 stated that at least 75 percent of pupils who met the treatment group attendance criterion would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their regular reading courses (grades 6-8). Desired Outcome 3 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils in grade 1 would read at least five books at level 8 or above as certified by Chapter 1 teacher, and that at least 50 percent of the pupils in grades 2 and above in the treatment group who were not discontinued would independently read a minimum of ten books certified by the Chapter 1 teacher.

Evaluation Design: The Evaluation Design included the Desired Outcomes stated above and the instruments used to measure them. Desired Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 were evaluated by means of locally constructed instruments and/or the district computer files. Guidelines for Federal and State aggregated NCE change scores require an aggregate gain of at least 2.0 NCE in both Reading Comprehension and Total Reading at the building level. Norm-referenced tests were administered in a spring-to-spring testing

cycle to evaluate the aggregate gain. The *Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition (MAT6)*, were used for grades 1 and 2 and grades 3-8 received the *California Achievement Tests* (CAT, 1985) in the spring of 1994. Analyses of the pretest to posttest data used for determining the aggregate gain were primarily in terms of NCE change scores. Although not part of the evaluation design, parent involvement information was also collected by program teachers.

Major Findings: The information collected on program pupils indicated the program served 5946 public and nonpublic pupils for an average of 3.4 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 4763.3 pupils. The average days of enrollment (days scheduled) per pupil was 99.6 days and the average attendance (days served) per pupil was 81.8 days.

Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 1-8) in the treatment period (those who attended the program at least 50 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued and were English-speaking) will display evidence of each strategic processing behavior at least once during the treatment period when reading appropriate instructional text to the satisfaction of the Chapter 1 teacher. This outcome was achieved. Of the 4649 pupils in the treatment group, 3939 pupils (84.7%) met the criterion.

Desired Outcome 2 stated that at least 75 percent of pupils meeting the treatment group attendance criterion would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their regular reading courses (grades 6-8). This Desired Outcome was met at every grade level. Of the 4506 pupils in this treatment group 91.7% (4133 pupils) were promoted or passed their target courses.

Desired Outcome 3 stated that at least 50 percent of grade 1 treatment group pupils would read five books at or above text reading level 8 as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher and that at least 50 percent of grade 2 and above treatment group pupils, who were not discontinued, would independently read a minimum of ten books as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. This Desired Outcome was met at every grade. Of the 4637 pupils in the treatment group, 4224 (91.1%) of the pupils read the requisite number of books for their grade.

Additional analyses of aggregate achievement scores for Total Reading (basic skills) and for Comprehension (advanced skills) for grades 2-8 were required by Federal and State guidelines. The Total Reading aggregate achievement scores for grades 2-8 showed that for the evaluation sample of 3708 pupils, the average change score across grades was 2.6 NCE points. Changes ranged from 5.9 NCEs in grade 5 to a negative change of -1.3 NCEs in grade 6. For Comprehension the aggregate achievement scores for grades 2-8 showed that for the evaluation sample of 3805 pupils the average change score across grades was 3.4 NCE points. Changes ranged from 7.7 NCEs in grade 2 to a negative change of -1.1 NCEs in grade 8.

Parent involvement data indicated that an unduplicated count of 5946 pupils served, 4592 pupils (77.2%) had one or more parents who participated in parent involvement activities.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor the record-keeping procedures of teachers. Telephone conferences, on-site visitations, and inspections of records were instrumental in assuring accuracy.

Recommendations: The following recommendations were made: (a) the program should be continued; (b) ways to improve attendance need to be studied; (c) inservice to program teachers needs to be continued; (d) record keeping and data collection should continue to be monitored; and (e) joint planning between regular staff, administrators, and program teachers must be assured.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM

1993-94

Program Description

The Chapter 1 Reading Program served 5946 pupils. Funding of the component was made available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1 of Title I of 1965, reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988.

The primary goal of the ESEA Chapter 1 Reading Programs was to help public and nonpublic students to become successful readers and learners at their grade levels *(Policy Guide and Handbook for ESEA Chapter 1 Programs*, 1993: Compiled by the Department of Competency Based Education, Federal and State Programs). This goal was two-pronged. The goal was to be accomplished by program teachers who were to provide two major services; supplementary instruction to selected students experiencing difficulty in reading and writing in their regular classroom setting and opportunities for parent involvement through conferences, group meetings, classroom visits and progress reports.

The first target of the goal, provide supplementary instruction, stated that the supplementary instruction was to support the classroom instruction and to focus on the individual needs of public and nonpublic students who were identified for service. Nonpublic pupils in nonpublic schools, which qualified for Chapter 1 service, received instruction in mobile classroom units which travelled to the school sites. Specific support was provided to both public and nonpublic students by reinforcing the reading and writing strategies/activities of the regular classroom and/or providing theme-related materials whenever possible.

Section Four: Instructions, as delineated in the *Policy Guide and Handbook for ESEA Chapter 1 Programs (Summer 1993),* stated that each teacher's program was to be structured so that a visitor should observe the following facets:

1. Learning Environment: Teacher had created a literature environment and a positive and purposeful classroom climate.

2. Support Materials: Teacher used support materials which revealed a well-organized and focused instructional program.

3. Instructional Expectations: Teacher had developed a well-organized and focused instructional program which incorporated reading and writing of whole text, rereading of familiar text, and other instructional activities to meet individual needs.

4. Required Documentation: Teacher adhered to Chapter 1 guidelines.

The facet, "Required Documentation: Teacher Adhered to Chapter 1 Guidelines," dealt with maintaining up-to-date student selection information on the selection printout and current selection test information; attendance records; posted class schedules and weekly schedules; records of ongoing coordination meetings; and parent involvement records. All of these records were used to monitor the program throughout the year by the Department of Program Evaluation and by the Federal and State Programs personnel. Monitoring of the other instructional expectations was assumed by Federal and State Programs instructional personnel. The second target of the goal was that teachers provide opportunities for parent involvement through conferences, group meetings, classroom visits and progress reports since

parent involvement was considered essential to the goal of helping students to become successful readers and learners at their grade levels. Records were kept for number of contacts between program teachers and parents. These data were reported to the appropriate monitoring personnel.

The Chapter 1 Reading Program was staffed by 168 (unduplicated count) public and nonpublic teachers serving in 174 program units in 123 schools. One Chapter 1 tutor and her school were included in this census. Of the 123 schools with program units, 112 were in public schools and 11 were in Chapter 1 eligible nonpublic schools. Of the 112 public schools, 86 were elementary and 26 were middle. The Nonpublic Project served grades 1-8. Of the 168 teachers in the total program, 111 were public elementary school teachers (including the one tutor), 48 were public middle school teachers, and 9 were nonpublic school teachers. Since some teachers were assigned to two schools, the 168 teachers taught in a total of 174 program units. Of these, 114 program units were in public elementary schools (including tutor), 49 units were in public middle schools, and 11 program units were in the Nonpublic Project schools (grades 1-8).

Fifty-eight (an unduplicated count) of the 168 Chapter 1 Reading Program teachers (public and nonpublic) were combination teachers, i.e., Combos. For this report, to be considered a Combo teacher, the teacher had to be assigned both reading and mathematics at the same school. For definition purposes, teaching mathematics at one school and reading at another site made the teacher a half-time reading or a half-time mathematics teacher (not a Combo). Combos served in both the reading program and in the mathematics program at the same school. Evaluation of the mathematics program is reported separately (Gibbons, 1994).

Chapter 1 public school program teachers (both elementary and middle school) were funded 90 percent by Chapter 1 funds and 10 percent by the district's general fund. They were called Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers. According to Federal and State Program guidelines for implementing the Chapter 1 Reading Program, the public elementary and middle school, full-time Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers were to provide instruction to a maximum of 36 pupils (half-time teachers 18 pupils) during the day, nine times during a two-week cycle, for a minimum of 40-60 minutes per day. This was the prevailing pattern of service. Instruction took place in regular classrooms or in rooms equipped as language laboratories.

Chapter 1 Nonpublic Project teachers (elementary and middle school) were funded 100 per cent by Chapter 1 funds and provided instruction individually, or in groups of four or five, to pupils two-to-five times per week, for 45 minute periods. They provided service off church property in mobile classroom units. Because Nonpublic Project teachers were Columbus school employees and were part of the Chapter 1 Reading Program, they followed ESEA Chapter 1 guidelines.[1]

Pupils qualified for the program based on a Selection Score (Grade 1) or a Service Index Number (Grades 2-8). The Selection Score used in Grade 1 was based on the scores from two Observational Tasks: Dictation and Concepts about Print (Clay, 1979). The Service Index Number used in grades 2-8 was based on a Total Reading Score adjusted for the pupil's age-grade. Pupils were then selected for service based on greatest need according to rank-order.

The Chapter 1 Reading Program served a total of 5946 pupils. Of the 5946 total, 3891 pupils (grades 1-5) were served in the public elementary school projects, 1778 pupils were served in the public middle school project, and the Nonpublic Project schools served 277 pupils in grades 1-8.

A further breakdown of the pupil census showed that at the primary level (grades 1-3), a total of 2854 public and nonpublic school pupils received service. At the intermediate level (grades 4-5), a total of 1270 public and nonpublic school pupils received service; and at the middle school level, (grades 6-8) a total of 1822 public and nonpublic school pupils were served.

Evaluation Design

Desired Outcomes

Three Desired Outcomes (performance objectives) to be achieved by program pupils were delineated for the Chapter 1 Reading Program as follows:

Desired Outcome 1: At least 50 percent of the pupils in grades 1-8 who attended the program at least 50 percent of the treatment period or were discontinued will display evidence of each strategic processing behavior at least once during the treatment period when reading appropriate instructional text to the satisfaction of the Chapter 1 teacher.

Desired Outcome 2: At least 75 percent of the pupils in grades 1-8 who attended the program at least 50 percent of the treatment period or were discontinued will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom as demonstrated by promotion to the next grade level at the elementary level or by passing the course in which reading instruction occurs at the middle school level. At the middle school level only pupils who are enrolled in a reading course will be included.

Desired Outcome 3: Of the grade 1 pupils who were discontinued or attended the program at least 50 percent of the treatment period, at least 50 percent of the pupils will read at least five books at text reading level 8 or above as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. At least 50 percent of the pupils in grades 2 and above who attended the program at least 50 percent of the treatment period and were not discontinued will independently read throughout the treatment period a minimum of ten books as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher.

Federal and State Guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension for individual buildings. The criterion performance level for the Federal and State Guidelines is an aggregate gain of at least 2.0 NCEs in both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension at the building level. The overall aggregate NCE score for grades 2-8 are reported in the findings section of this report. Building level aggregate scores were reported to the state.

Program Timelines and Patterns of Service Delivery

Because all three Desired Outcomes defined the evaluation sample or the treatment group in terms of pupils who satisfied attendance requirements for the instructional period, the reader should be aware of the program timelines and the program teacher Patterns of Service Delivery in the Chapter 1 Reading Program.

For evaluation purposes, the program time period for aggregate test scores required by Federal and State Guidelines was a maximum of 105 days beginning September 20, 1993, and ending March 18, 1994, for all grades and all projects. In order to be in the evaluation sample for this outcome pupils had to meet an attendance criterion, be English-speaking, and have a valid pretest and posttest score.

For pupils in grades 1-8, the program time period established for evaluating Desired Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 was 134 days maximum beginning September 20, 1993 and ending May 6, 1994. In order to be included in the treatment group for the Desired Outcomes pupils had to meet an attendance criterion.

The program timelines were in effect for all pupils except for those who were discontinued. Discontinued pupils were certified as no longer needing the program. To discontinue a pupil, the program teacher had to follow criteria set forth by Federal and State Programs. Any child discontinued following due process was automatically included in both treatment groups (regardless of their attendance).

However, there were some variations in the maximum number of program days (amounting to a day or two more or less) for the nonpublic schools. This difference occurred when their schedules differed from the Columbus Public School scheduled vacation days, inservice days, parent conference days, professional days, and snow days.

Public school Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers were funded 90 percent from Chapter 1 funds and 10 percent from the district's General Fund. Nonpublic Project teachers were funded 100 percent from Chapter 1 funds. General Fund time was not used for Chapter 1 pupils. Because of this, the maximum number of scheduled days (enrollment) for pupils was dependent upon each teacher's Pattern of Service Delivery. Even though the program guidelines defined the program time period giving the maximum number of possible school session days, each teacher's pattern of service dictated how many days would be counted as scheduled days for pupils in that unit. The most common service pattern for Elementary Reading Consulting Teachers was 9 days out of 10. All Middle School Reading Consulting Teachers had a service pattern of 5 days out of 5.

Instruments

The evaluation design required the collection of data in six areas of operation for the overall program: (1) Pupil Census; (2) Standardized Achievement Testing; (3) Evidence of Strategic Processing Behavior; (4) Retainee/Course Failure; (5) Number of Books Read; and (6) Parent Involvement. Though not required for the evaluation design, data from selected inservice meetings and process evaluation were collected, analyzed, and reported to Federal and State Programs. Specific instruments are discussed below. Copies of instruments used to collect the data are found in Appendix B, with the exception of the standardized achievement tests, computer files, and some variations of the inservice evaluation form. Inservice evaluation forms were adapted to fit specific inservices, two examples of which are found in Appendix B, pages 37-38.

1. Pupil Census Instruments

   Calendar Worksheet for Recording Days of Pupil Service. The Calendar Worksheet was locally developed to help program teachers collect program scheduled/service data. A Calendar Worksheet was kept for each pupil. The form included the following information: the pupil's name, birthdate, student number, ethnic or race code, sex, grade level, and the Selection Score/Service Index Number. These forms were kept up-to-date by the program teachers so that correct information was available to report at the end of the year on the Pupil Data Sheet. These forms were examined periodically for process evaluation. See page 29 of Appendix B for copy of form.

   Pupil Roster 1993-94. In February 1994, a computer-generated roster of pupils sorted by program, school, and teacher's social security number within grade was sent to program teachers. Program teachers checked names of all pupils enrolled and served during the 1993-94 school year. If teachers taught in two or more compensatory programs, they completed a roster for each program (see page 30, Appendix B for a sample copy).

   Pupil Data Sheet. The Pupil Data Sheet was developed to help program teachers summarize at the end of year the pupil information from the Calendar Worksheets and parent information from the Parent Involvement Log. This instrument was used to collect the following information: identification of pupils who were English-speaking; subjective ratings of pupil progress given by teachers; the number of hours of instruction per week; identification of pupils who were discontinued; whether or not a parent helped with homework or read to child or vice versa; an enumeration of five parent involvement activities; the number of books read; the number of days of service received; and lastly, the teacher's pattern of service. A copy of the instrument can be found on pages 31-32 of Appendix B.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Instruments

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). First- and second-grade pupils were administered the *Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth edition (MAT6, 1985)*, which were published by the Psychological Corporation/Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. This test series has two sets of norms (national and nonpublic) for fall and spring. Standardization was established between October 1 and 31 in 1984 for fall, and spring standardization was established between April 8 and May 15 in 1985. Special testing of grade 3 program pupils occurred April 20-29, 1994 as a posttest for grade 3 pupils who took the MAT6 in Spring 1993 as their pretest as second-graders.

California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985). The *California Achievement Tests* (CAT, 1985) were administered to program pupils in grades 3-8 in Spring 1994. This test series, which is also published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established in the fall of 1984 and the spring of 1985.

All testing was done on level using the Norm-Referenced Model for evaluation of the Chapter 1 Reading Program. A spring-to-spring testing cycle was used for grades 2-8. The form, subtest, and test levels used for each grade level are shown in Table 1.

The achievement tests were administered as follows: Pretests and posttests for grades 2-8 were administered as part of Districtwide Testing in Spring 1993 and Spring 1994. Pupils in grade 1 were also tested as part of Districtwide Testing in Spring 1994 in order to establish pretest scores for the 1994-95 school year. During Districtwide Testing, tests were administered by classroom teachers with program teachers serving as proctors. Program teachers in the nonpublic schools (serving grades 1-8) followed the same testing schedule but administered their own pretests and posttests.

3. Instruments for Recording Evidence of Strategic Processing Behaviors for Desired Outcome 1

A locally developed instrument (Collection Form for Desired Outcome 1: Evidence of Strategic Processing) was constructed to assist teachers in maintaining records and reporting data at the end of the year. A copy of this form is found in Appendix B, page 33. This form was not collected for auditing purposes by the Department of Program Evaluation. This form was used by program teachers to record summary information within a given time period about whether or not a strategic processing behavior was observed in that time period. The final outcomes were reported to the Department of Program Evaluation on the Pupil Data Sheet.

4. Retainee/Course Failure Instruments for Measuring Desired Outcome 2.

District Retention File and District Grade Reporting File. At the end of the year, information regarding retention was obtained from the district retention file for public school elementary pupils in grades 1-5. The course failure information for middle school pupils was obtained from the district grade reporting file for public school pupils in grades 6-8. This information was used to determine the percentage of pupils meeting the criterion of Desired Outcome 2.

Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form. A locally developed instrument, Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form, was designed to collect the Nonpublic Project (grades 1-8) retention/course failure data. This printout was a roster of pupil names with spaces for marking whether or not an elementary pupil was retained or for recording the final grade received by a middle school pupil in reading. The retainee/course failure information for nonpublic schools was collected by program teachers and reported (via telephone) to the Department of Program Evaluation. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix B, page 34.

Table 1

Table of Standardized Achievement Measures
for Chapter 1 Reading Program
1993-94

Program Component	Grade	Pretest				Posttest			
		Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)	Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)
		Spring 1993				Spring 1994			
		Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6)							
Elementary School Reading (Grades 1-5)	1	---	--	--	---	MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading[a]
	2	MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading	MAT6	P1	L	Total Reading
	3	MAT6	P1	L	Total Reading	MAT6	P2	L	Total Reading
		California Achievement Tests, 1985 Edition (CAT)							
	3	---	--	--	---	CAT	13	E	Total Reading[b]
	4	CAT	13	E	Total Reading	CAT	14	E	Total Reading
	5	CAT	14	E	Total Reading	CAT	15	E	Total Reading
Middle School Reading (Grades 6-8)	6	CAT	15	E	Total Reading	CAT	16	E	Total Reading
	7	CAT	16	E	Total Reading	CAT	17	E	Total Reading
	8	CAT	17	E	Total Reading	CAT	18	E	Total Reading

Note. The MAT6 Total Reading score includes the Vocabulary, Word Recognition, and Reading Comprehension Subtests, and the CAT Total Reading Scores include the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtests.

[a]The MAT6 Level PR, Form L was administered to grade 1 pupils as part of the Districtwide Testing activity. This test will serve as a pretest for the 1994-95 school year for pupils who are promoted to grade 2.

[b]The CAT Level 13, Form E was administered to grade 3 pupils as part of the Districtwide Testing activity. This test will serve as a pretest for the 1994-95 school year for pupils who are promoted to grade 4.

P:\P502\FCT94TBL

5. Instruments for Recording Number of Books Read for Desired Outcome 3

   Locally developed instruments (Pupil Independent Reading Record Sheets) were constructed to assist teachers in maintaining records and reporting data at the end of the year. An example of this form is found in Appendix B, page 35. These primary sources were not collected for auditing purposes by the Department of Program Evaluation. The reading record sheets were used by program teachers to maintain listings of books pupils had successfully read. The final number of books read by each pupil was reported to the Department of Program Evaluation on the Pupil Data Sheet.

6. Parent Involvement Instrument

   Parent Involvement Log. The Parent Involvement Log was a locally developed instrument designed to assist teachers in keeping a record of how many parents and the number of parent contacts. Teachers were asked to collect data for two activities which could occur at anytime during the year: whether or not the parent helped the child with homework and whether or not the parent read to the child or the child read to the parent. Teachers were also asked to record how many parents were involved in the following five activities: involvement in planning, attendance at group meetings, individual conferences, parental classroom visits, and home visits (see page 36, Appendix B).

   Pupil Data Sheet. This instrument, described earlier, was used by teachers to help summarize data from their Parent Involvement Logs. A copy can be found in Appendix B, pages 31-32.

As stated at the beginning of the Instruments section of this report, data for selected inservice meetings and process evaluation were collected, although not required by the evaluation design. Locally developed instruments were designed by Federal and State Programs in conjunction with the Department of Program Evaluation to obtain teacher perceptions regarding selected inservice sessions. The forms were administered to participants at the close of each formally evaluated inservice session. The inservice evaluation forms were usually adapted to fit specific inservices, but two representative examples of inservice evaluation forms can be found on pages 37-38, Appendix B. While the design did not provide for the collection of these data (nor are the findings reported here), interim inservice evaluation reports were forwarded to Federal and State Programs, where they are available on request. See Table A-1 on pages 25-26 of Appendix A for dates and topics of inservice meetings which were evaluated.

A discussion of the results from process evaluation, which was conducted periodically throughout the year, appears later in this report.

Major Findings

Three Chapter 1 Reading Program projects served elementary (grades 1-5) and middle school pupils (grades 6-8) in the public schools and grades 1-8 in the nonpublic schools. Achievement data for the Nonpublic Project (NP) and the public school project were generally aggregated as a single entity for reporting purposes in the results section of this report. The same Desired Outcomes were expected from both public and nonpublic projects.

Pupil Census Information

A total of 5946 pupils, including 5669 pupils in public schools (grades 1-8) and 277 in nonpublic schools (grades 1-8), was served by the ESEA Chapter 1 Reading Program during the 1993-94 school year for an average of 3.4 hours of instruction per week. Of the 5946 public and nonpublic school pupils,

Pupil Census Information (cont'd)

4124 were in grades 1 through 5 and 1822 pupils attended middle schools. Generally, the 277 nonpublic elementary and middle school pupils' enrollment and attendance data were subsumed in the public school data.

The average daily membership in the overall program was 4763.3 pupils. The average days scheduled (enrollment) per pupil was 99.6 days, and the average days served (attendance) per pupil was 81.8 days. Data pertaining to enrollment and attendance are presented in Table 2.

Pupil census information also included teachers' subjective ratings of pupil progress as pupils exited the program. Of the 5946 pupils served in the program, 1871 (31.5%) were rated by their program teachers as making much progress, 3631 (61.1%) as making some progress, 437 (7.4%) as making no progress, and 7 (0.1%) were unrated.

Desired Outcome 1 Information

Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 1-8) in the treatment group (those who met the attendance criterion or were discontinued and were English-speaking) will display evidence of each strategic processing behavior at least once during the treatment period when reading appropriate instructional text to the satisfaction of the Chapter 1 teacher. This outcome was achieved. Of the 4649 pupils in the treatment group, 3939 pupils (84.7%) met the criteria. Results for Desired Outcome 1 are presented by grade level in Table 3.

Desired Outcome 2 Information

Desired Outcome 2 stated that 75 percent of the pupils in grades 1-8 who attended the program at least 50 percent of the treatment period or were discontinued will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom as demonstrated by promotion to the next grade level at the elementary level or by passing the course in which reading instruction occurs at the middle school level. At the middle school level only pupils who are enrolled in a reading course were included.

Information for the nonpublic school Chapter 1 Reading Program was collected from program teachers via telephone and recorded on the Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form, a locally developed instrument. Program teachers consulted with each pupil's classroom teacher at the end of the year to determine which pupils were not promoted to the next grade in elementary or failed to pass reading at the middle school level.

Retainee/course failure. Table 4 presents the Desired Outcome 2 results. Of the 5946 pupils served, 4506 pupils were in the treatment group. Of the 4506 pupils in the treatment group, 4133 (91.7%) were promoted to the next grade or passed their reading courses. In the elementary grades the percent of pupils who were promoted to the next grade ranged from 99.1% in grade 5 to 84.5% in grade 1. In the middle school grades the percent of pupils who passed their reading courses ranged from 87.0% in grade 8 to 82.5% in grade 6. The criterion for measuring Desired Outcome 2 was that 75 percent of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade (elementary pupils) or pass their reading courses (middle school pupils). This criterion was exceeded at every grade level. Thus Desired Outcome 2 was attained.

Table 2

Number of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Served; Averages for Days Scheduled, Days Served, Daily Membership, and Hours of Instruction Per Week Reported by Grade Level for Chapter 1 Reading Programs
1993-94

Grade	N	Girls	Boys	Average			
				Days Scheduled[a]	Days Served[b]	Daily Membership[c]	Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week
1	203	87	116	94.2	80.5	160.1	3.3
2	1358	571	787	95.5	80.9	1067.2	3.3
3	1293	576	717	95.9	81.7	1029.1	3.3
4	698	298	400	96.6	80.6	561.8	3.3
5	572	272	300	95.4	77.9	454.2	3.3
6	648	285	363	109.5	84.6	534.8	3.5
7	671	342	329	108.1	83.6	549.2	3.4
8	503	216	287	106.6	84.8	407.1	3.5
Total	5946	2647	3299	99.6	81.8	4763.3	3.4

[a]Days scheduled included days the pupils were scheduled and NOT served as well as days pupils WERE served. Scheduled days for all pupils began September 20, 1993 and ended for all projects on May 6, 1994.

[b]Days served were days pupils actually received instruction.

[c]Average Daily Membership was dependent on the Pattern of Service Delivery used by individual teachers.

Table 3

Total Number of Pupils in Treatment Group and Number and Percent of Pupils Meeting Criterion for Desired Outcome 1 for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program by Grade Level
1993-94

	Desired Outcome 1 Strategic Processing		
		Meeting Criteria[a]	
Grade	N	n	%
1	166	140	84.3
2	1075	864	67.3
3	1038	871	48.3
4	568	477	57.1
5	451	391	77.2
6	480	415	47.8
7	499	445	65.3
8	372	336	42.7
Total	4649	3939	84.7

[a] The desired outcome for strategic processing stated that at least 50% of pupils in the grade 1-8 treatment group display evidence of each of three strategic processing behaviors at least once during the treatment period.

Table 4

Total Treatment Group and Number and Percent of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Who Passed/Failed in Regard to Promotion to Next Grade (Grades 1-5) or Reading/Language Arts Course (Grades 6-8) 1993-94

	Desired Outcome 2					
	Promotion to Next Grade (Elementary)			Pass Reading Course (Middle School)		
		Outcome Achieved[a]		Sample	Outcome Achieved[b]	
Grade	N	n	%	N	n	%
1	161	136	84.5	--	--	--
2	1046	963	92.1	--	--	--
3	1015	969	95.5	--	--	--
4	557	534	95.9	--	--	--
5	432	428	99.1	--	--	--
6	--	--	--	463	382	82.5
7	--	--	--	485	419	86.4
8	--	--	--	347	302	87.0
Total	3211	3030	94.4	1295	1103	85.2

[a] The desired outcome for elementary pupils stated that at least 75% of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade. [b]The desired outcome for middle school pupils stated that at least 75% of the pupils in the treatment group would pass the course in which reading instruction occurred.

Desired Outcome 3 Information

Desired Outcome 3 stated that of the grade 1 pupils who were discontinued or attended the program at least 50 percent of the treatment period, at least 50 percent of the pupils will read at least five books at text reading level 8 or above as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. At least 50 percent of the pupils in grades 2 and above who attended the program at least 50 percent of the treatment period and were not discontinued will independently read throughout the treatment period a minimum of ten books as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher.

Information was collected by a locally constructed instrument (Pupil Data Sheet) at the end of the year. Program teachers submitted summary information on the form. The results from the analysis for Desired Outcome 3 showed that of 4637 pupils in the treatment group, 4224 (91.1%) of the pupils met the criterion of reading the requisite number of books for every grade level. See Table 5 for the results of the analysis by grade for Number of Books read.

Text reading level. To meet the criterion on number and level of books read for Desired Outcome 3, first-grade pupils had to read at least five books at or above text reading level 8. Of the 203 first-grade pupils served, 166 first-grade pupils were in the treatment group. Of the 166 pupils in the treatment group, 140 pupils (84.3%) successfully completed reading at least five books at or above text reading level 8 as certified by the Chapter 1 program teacher.

Independent reading. The task criterion for Desired Outcome 3 for Grade 2 and above involved pupils' reading independently a minimum of ten books as certified by the Chapter 1 program teacher. Of the 5743 pupils served in grades 2-8, 4471 pupils were in the treatment group. Of the 4471 pupils in the treatment group, 4084 pupils (91.3%) successfully completed reading independently at least ten books as certified by the Chapter 1 program teacher.

Standardized Achievement Test Information

To meet Federal and State guidelines, program pupils were included in either or both of two evaluation samples. One was comprised of pupils who attended the program at least 50 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued, were English speaking, and had a valid Total Reading pretest and posttest score. The second was comprised of pupils who attended the program at least 50 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued, were English-speaking, and had a valid Reading Comprehension pretest and posttest score. Some pupils might have met the criteria for only one evaluation sample. Federal and State Guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Total Reading (Basic Skills) and Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) for individual buildings.

Of the 5946 pupils served, 24 (0.4%) were non-English speaking and 185 (3.1%) were eligible for Special Education. The final evaluation sample for the Total Reading analysis was 3708 pupils, or 62.4% of the pupils served. Excluded from the evaluation sample for Total Reading were 2238 pupils (non-English speaking pupils, Special Education pupils, and pupils who had not attained the attendance criterion and/or had incomplete test data). Of the 5946 pupils served, 2141 pupils were excluded from the Reading Comprehension analysis for the same reasons as above. The final evaluation sample for the Reading Comprehension analysis was comprised of the remaining 3805 pupils, which was 64.0% of the pupils served.

Evaluation of total reading performance. Of the 3708 pupils in the sample for total reading performance, 2510 were in the public elementary school sample and 1104 were in the middle school sample. The nonpublic school evaluation sample had a total of 94 pupils.

Table 5

Total Treatment Group and Number and Percent of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Who Read at Least Five Books At or Above Text Reading Level 8 (Grade 1) or Who Were Not Discontinued and Read at Least Ten Books (Grades 2-8)
1993-94

Grade	Treatment Group	Number of Books Read			Pupils Meeting Performance Criterion[a]	
		Min.	Max.	Average	n	%
(Grades 2-8)		*Text Reading Level At or Above Level 8 (Grade 1)*				
1	166	0	15	5.9	140	84.3
		Independent Reading (Grades 2-8)				
2	1065	0	63	13.7	959	90.0
3	1036	0	115	15.3	967	93.3
4	568	4	58	14.2	529	93.1
5	450	3	58	13.4	418	92.9
6	482	1	67	12.0	432	89.6
7	499	0	35	11.9	446	89.4
8	371	0	38	12.5	333	89.8
Subtotal (Grades 2-8)	4471	0	115	13.6	4084	91.3
Total	4637	0	115	13.3	4224	91.1

[a] The criterion for grade 1 was to read at least five books at or above Text Reading Level 8. The criterion for grades 2-8 was that pupils who were not discontinued would read at least ten books, as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher.

Overall results for normal curve equivalents (NCE) for the 3708 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Total Reading are presented in Table 6. Aggregate achievement scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Federal Assistance, and are available on request. For purposes of this report, only the average NCE scores for Total Reading by grade and total program are reported here. The overall average gain for the program was 2.6 NCE points. Positive changes occurred in the following grades with average gains as follows: 5.9 NCEs in grade 5, 4.5 NCEs in grade 7, 2.9 NCEs in grade 2, 2.4 NCEs in grade 4, 2.1 NCEs in grade 3, 1.3 NCEs in grade 8. A negative change of -1.3 NCEs occurred in grade 6. For readers interested in percentile statistics for Total Reading, see Table A-2 in Appendix A, page 27.

Evaluation of reading comprehension performance. Of the 3805 pupils in the evaluation sample for reading comprehension performance, 2588 were in the public elementary school sample and 1123 were in the middle school sample. The nonpublic school sample had a total of 94 pupils.

Overall results for normal curve equivalents (NCE) for the 3805 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Reading Comprehension are presented in Table 7. Aggregate achievement scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Federal Assistance, and are available on request. For purposes of this report, only the average NCE scores for Reading Comprehension by grade and total program are reported here. The overall average gain for the program was 3.4 NCE points. Positive changes occurred in the following grades with average gains as follows: 7.7 NCEs in grade 2, 5.3 NCEs in grade 5, 5.1 NCEs in grade 7, 1.9 NCEs in grade 3, and 1.5 NCEs in grade 4. At grade 6 there was a negative change of -0.2 NCE and negative change of -1.1 NCEs in grade 8.

Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. It should be kept in mind that NCEs are based on percentiles which compare the pupil's performance in relation to the general population. For a pupil's NCE score to remain the same at posttest as at pretest does not denote a lack of absolute progress; on the contrary, it means that the pupil has maintained the same relative position in terms of the general population. Even a small gain in NCEs indicates an advancement from the pupil's original level of achievement. For readers interested in percentile statistics for Reading Comprehension, see Table A-3 in Appendix A, page 27.

Basic and advanced skills aggregated scores for Federal and State Guidelines. According to Federal and State Guidelines school buildings will be designated for School Program Improvement in Reading in two ways: (1) when any Desired Outcome for the program is not met at the building level, or (2) when the aggregate NCE change score for the building is less than 2.0 NCEs in Basic Skills (Total Reading) and/or Advanced Skills (Reading Comprehension). Buildings in School Improvement are required to submit a plan delineating how they will strengthen their program.

For purposes of this report, only summary data by grade are presented for standardized test data. Aggregate scores for Total Reading are presented in Table 6, and aggregate scores for Reading Comprehension are presented in Table 7.

Table 8 presents program pupil performance in Basic Skills and Advanced Skills in relation to the state mandated criterion of 2.0 NCE gain. As indicated in Table 8, 1933 pupils (52.1%) made gains of 2.0 or more NCE points in Basic Skills (Total Reading) and 2019 pupils (53.1%) made gains of 2.0 or more NCE points in Advanced Skills (Reading Comprehension).

Table 6

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) and Overall Average NCE Change for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Total Reading Performance Reported by Grade Level 1993-94

Grade	Sample	Pretest				Posttest				Overall Average NCE Change[a]
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
2	830	1.0	84.6	21.6	13.7	1.0	77.0	24.5	15.2	2.9[b]
3	880	1.0	55.3	22.2	11.3	1.0	99.0	24.3	14.7	2.1[b]
4	468	1.0	56.0	25.1	10.1	1.0	69.0	27.5	11.7	2.4[b]
5	410	1.0	51.0	25.0	10.2	1.0	87.0	30.8	12.1	5.9[b]
6	381	1.0	53.0	26.9	8.8	1.0	57.0	25.6	11.6	-1.3
7	419	1.0	44.0	24.0	9.6	1.0	58.0	28.4	11.1	4.5[b]
8	320	1.0	45.0	23.8	9.9	2.0	53.0	25.1	9.7	1.3
Total	3708	1.0	84.6	23.6	11.2	1.0	99.0	26.1	13.3	2.6

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 in Spring 1993 and Spring 1994. Grades 3-8 received the CAT in Spring 1993 and in Spring 1994.

[a] Federal and State guidelines require an aggregate gain of 2.0 NCE points at **the building level**.

[b] Overall aggregate gain at or above Federal/State guidelines.

Table 7

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) and Overall Average NCE Change for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Reading Comprehension Performance Reported by Grade Level 1993-94

Grade	Sample	Pretest				Posttest				Overall Average NCE Change[a]
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
2	867	1.0	69.3	21.6	13.7	1.0	99.0	29.3	15.5	7.7[b]
3	898	1.0	69.3	26.7	11.9	1.0	99.0	28.6	16.3	1.9
4	488	1.0	57.0	28.0	10.7	3.0	68.0	29.5	12.6	1.5
5	413	3.0	57.0	27.7	11.3	9.0	77.0	33.0	11.9	5.3[b]
6	383	9.0	53.0	29.6	9.6	1.0	70.0	29.4	12.2	-0.2
7	430	1.0	57.0	26.8	11.1	6.0	66.0	31.9	10.9	5.1[b]
8	326	6.0	56.0	28.2	10.4	1.0	60.0	27.1	11.5	-1.1
Total	3805	1.0	69.3	26.2	12.0	1.0	99.0	29.7	13.9	3.4[b]

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 in Spring 1993 and Spring 1994. Grades 3-8 received the CAT in Spring 1993 and in Spring 1994.

[a] Federal and State guidelines require an aggregate gain of 2.0 NCE points **at the building level**.

[b] Overall aggregate gain at or above Federal/State guidelines.

Table 8

Frequencies and Percents of Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) Change Score Categories in Basic Skills and Advanced Skills by Grade in Relation to the State Established Criteria for Program Improvement
1993-94

	NCE Improvement Change Categories									
	Basic Skills[a]					Advanced Skills[b]				
		2.0 or More		3.0 or More			2.0 or More		3.0 or More	
Grade	Sample	n	%	n	%	Sample	n	%	n	%
2	830	426	51.3	399	48.1	867	566	64.1	536	61.8
3	880	428	48.6	384	43.6	898	416	46.3	392	43.7
4	468	264	56.4	240	51.3	488	250	51.2	228	46.7
5	410	269	65.6	251	61.2	413	254	61.5	237	57.4
6	381	140	36.7	130	34.1	383	156	40.7	144	37.6
7	419	251	59.9	231	55.1	430	260	60.5	244	56.7
8	320	155	48.4	135	42.2	326	127	39.0	108	33.1
Total	3708	1933	52.1	1770	47.7	3805	2019	53.1	1889	49.6

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 in Spring 1993 and Spring 1994. Grades 3-8 received the CAT in Spring 1993 and in Spring 1994.

[a] Basic Skills = Total Reading Subtests

[b] Advanced Skills = Reading Comprehension Subtest

P:\P502\FCT94TBL

[Parent Involvement Information

Because parent involvement was considered essential to the goal of helping pupils become successful readers and learners at their grade levels, data were collected on this aspect of the program even though parent involvement was not included in the evaluation design. Teachers recorded parent involvement activities during the year on the Parent Involvement Log (Appendix B, page 36). The Pupil Data Sheet (Appendix B, pages 31-32) was used to collect summary data from teachers at the end of the year concerning program activities involving parents of program children. Parent Involvement data were analyzed in two ways: the number of parents who participated in parent involvement activities, and number of contacts by activity.

Overall parent involvement. Results of overall parent involvement for pupils served in five activities are presented in Table 9. Individual Conferences accounted for more parent involvement 5095 parents) than any other activity. Yearly totals for the other activities follow: group meeting with parents (1084 parents involved); parent classroom visits (939 parents involved); planning, (341 parents involved); and visits to parent homes by teacher (80 visits). Since a parent could have involvement in more than one activity, an unduplicated count of parents was obtained from program teachers at the end of the year using the Pupil Data Sheet. This count indicated that for the 5946 pupils served, a total of 5636 parents of program pupils were involved in a total of 11676 contacts during the school year. Of the 5946 pupils served, 4592 (77.2%) had from one to four adult members of their families involved in the above five activities. In addition to the five activities noted above, teachers also kept a record of two other activities: 1) Parent helped with child's homework and 2) Parent read to child or vice versa. Of the 5946 pupils served, 5119 (86.1%) had parents who helped their children with homework and the parents of 4969 pupils (83.6%) read to their children or vice versa.

Process Evaluation Information

Two methods were used to collect process evaluation information: auditing of Calendar Worksheets and Parent Involvement logs, and on-site visitations.

Audit. Teachers kept a Calendar Worksheet for each pupil to record scheduled/served days and other pupil information. On the reverse side of this instrument was the Parent Involvement Log which was used to record parent involvement information. Public school and nonpublic school teachers were asked to send a random sample of these records to their Program Evaluator in November 1993, and again in February 1994. After each teacher's records were reviewed, teachers were scheduled, as needed, for telephone conferences; problems were discussed and ameliorated.

On-site visitations. During December 1993 - January 1994, Program Evaluators conducted on-site school visitations to all program teachers to verify that the Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers and the Nonpublic Program teachers (a) were using appropriate pupil selection procedures, (b) had an up-to-date list of books read for each pupil, (c) had a current class schedule posted, (d) had identified and completed the appropriate forms for a student in Student Program Improvement, and (e) had verifiable evidence of biweekly coordination with classroom teachers. To facilitate this evaluation activity, the city was divided into geographical areas. Within each geographical area all project teachers in the program were visited by a Program Evaluator–regardless of whether the project units were reading or mathematics, public or nonpublic. Information gathered from on-site visitations was shared with program personnel.

Table 9

Number of Parents and Total Number of Contacts Reported for Parent Involvement Activities for the Public and Nonpublic Schools in the Chapter 1 Reading Program
1993-94

Program Activities	Totals for Year: Treatment Group Pupils[a] (N=4653)	Totals for Year: All Pupils Served (N=5946)
1. Parents involved in the planning, operation and/or evaluation of your unit		
Number of Parents	262	341
Number of Contacts	386	503
2. Group meetings for parents		
Number of Parents	988	1084
Number of Contacts	1118	1214
3. Individual parent conferences		
Number of Parents	4315	5095
Number of Contacts	7688	8824
4. Parental classroom visits or field trips		
Number of Parents	867	939
Number of Contacts	974	1050
5. Visits by teacher to parents' homes		
Number of Parents	67	80
Number of Contacts	71	85
Total Parents Contacted[b]	4787	5636
Total Number of Contacts	10237	11676

[a] Treatment Group Pupils are those who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or who were discontinued from the program.

[b] Total Parents Contacted is based on an unduplicated count of parents contacted, which is less than the sum obtained when combining the Number of Contacts for Activities 1-5.

Summary

The purpose of the Chapter 1 Reading Program was to provide assistance to selected underachieving pupils in grades one through eight in order that they might attain more fully their potential by improving their language and reading skills. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs, as determined by continued cooperation between the program teacher and the classroom teacher. Inservice sessions were provided for various subgroups of program teachers.

A total of 5946 pupils was served by the Chapter 1 Reading Program during the 1993-94 school year. Average daily membership in the overall program was 4763.3. The average days scheduled (enrolled) per pupil was 99.6, and the average days served (attended) per pupil was 81.8. The program was staffed with 168 teachers serving 112 public schools, and 11 nonpublic Chapter 1 eligible schools in 174 program units. Of the 5946 pupils served, 3891 pupils were served by 111 teachers in the elementary public school project, 1778 pupils were served by 48 teachers in the public middle school project, and 277 pupils were served by 9 teachers in the nonpublic school project.

The program was evaluated on the basis of three Desired Outcomes. Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the grade 1-8 treatment group display evidence of each of three strategic processing behaviors at least once during the treatment period. Analysis of data for Desired Outcome 1 shows that of the 4649 pupils in the treatment group, 3993 pupils (84.7%) met the criterion for Desired Outcome 1. Thus Desired Outcome 1 was achieved.

Desired Outcome 2 stated that 75 percent of pupils in the treatment group would demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom by promotion to the next grade (grades 1-5) or by passing the course in which reading instruction occurs (grades 6-8). The criterion was met in every project at every level with 4133 pupils (91.7%) of the 4506 pupils in the treatment group either being promoted or passing their courses. Desired Outcome 2 was met.

Desired Outcome 3 stated that of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group, at least 50 percent of the pupils will read at least five books at level 8 or above as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. At least 50 percent of the pupils in grades 2 and above in the treatment group who were not discontinued, will independently read a minimum of ten books certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. In grade 1, there were 166 pupils in the treatment group. Of these pupils, 140 (84.3%) successfully read the appropriate level and number of books. In grade 2 and above, 4471 pupils were in the treatment group. Of these pupils 4084 (91.3%) independently read the minimum number of ten books. Desired Outcome 3 was achieved.

Pretest/posttest analyses included two evaluation samples. Federal and State Guidelines required that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension for individual buildings. Consequently, Total Reading and Reading Comprehension test data were reported. Program pupils may have been in either or both of the samples. Both evaluation samples were comprised of pupils who attended the program at least 50 percent of the instructional period, were English-speaking, and had a Total Reading and/or a Reading Comprehension pretest and posttest score. Some pupils might have met the criteria for only one evaluation sample or for neither.

In regard to aggregate test results to meet Federal and State Guidelines, aggregate achievement scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Federal Assistance, and are available upon request. For purposes of this report, only the grade and total program NCE scores were reported. The overall average NCE change for the program was 2.6 in Total Reading and 3.4 in Reading Comprehension. Individual buildings were expected to show an aggregate gain of 2.0 NCE or more according to State Guidelines.

Parent involvement results showed that parents of 77.2% of the pupils served participated in designated Chapter 1 Reading Program activities. Teachers reported contact with parents for specified

activities. They reported an unduplicated total of 4787 parents of pupils served who were involved in one or more activities. Activities showing the most parent involvement were individual parent conferences, group meetings of parents, and parental classroom visits or field trips.

Process evaluation was conducted in two ways: periodic auditing of Calendar Worksheets and Parent Involvement Logs, and on-site visits. Results of process evaluation were shared with teachers and other program personnel.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to strengthen the 1994-95 Chapter 1 Reading Program:

1. Since the program was highly successful in achieving each of its Desired Outcomes, it is strongly recommended that the program be continued.

2. Of the 5946 pupils served in grades 1-8, 4653 (78.3%) met criterion to be included in any treatment group, i.e. attended 50 percent of time. Ways to improve attendance need to be studied.

3. Federal and State Program personnel should continue to provide supervision through inservice and school visitations to maintain the feeling among program teachers of having a strong support system.

4. The Department of Program Evaluation should continue monitoring of record keeping and data collection. This has been helpful in assuring the validity of data collected.

5. Administrators and staff should develop a plan to insure that joint planning with program teachers is occurring. Teacher schedules and locations in a building have sometimes acted as constraints to more frequent and formal joint planning particularly at the middle school level.

References

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters. (1985). California achievement tests. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Clay, M.M. (1979). The early detection of reading difficulties: A diagnostic survey and reading recovery procedures. Aukland, New Zealand: Heinemann Publishers.

ESEA Chapter 1 FY-94 program application (1993). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Federal and State Programs.

Policy guide and handbook for ESEA Chapter 1 programs. (Summer 1993). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Federal and State Programs.

Gibbons, M. (1995). Mathematics development component: Chapter 1 mathematics program, 1993-94. Final Evaluation Report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Lore, R. and Chamberlain, E. (1991). Language development component: Compensatory language experiences and reading (CLEAR), 1989-90. Final evaluation report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Lore, R. and Chamberlain, E. (1992). Language development component: Chapter 1 reading program, 1990-91 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1, Final Evaluation Report). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Lore R. and Chamberlain, E. (1993). Language development component: Chapter 1 reading program, 1991-92 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1, Final Evaluation Report). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Prescott, G. A., Balow, I. H., Hogan, T. P. and Farr, R. C. (1985). Metropolitan achievement tests, sixth edition. Chicago, Illinois: The Psychological Corporation.

Footnote

[1]One nonpublic school differed from other nonpublic schools served by the program in that (1) it was not a church-operated school, and (2) it served only pupils with learning disabilities and/or behavior disorders. Because it was not a church-operated school, program instruction was provided in the school building instead of in a mobile classroom unit.

Appendix A
Additional Tables

Table A-1

Dates and Topics of Evaluated Chapter 1 Inservice Meetings
Conducted for Public and Nonpublic Teachers in the
Chapter 1 Reading Program
1993-94

Date	Title of Inservice	Elementary (Grades 1-5)	Middle (Grades 6-8)	Nonpublic (Grades 1-8)
August 16-20, 1993 (nine sessions evaluated)	Chapter 1 Orientation	X	X	
August 23, 1993	Guided Reading	X		
August 23, 1994	Writing Workshop	(Program Name Not Indicated)		
August 23, 1994	Responding To Literature		X	
August 24, 1993	Inservice for New Consulting Teachers	X	X	
August 25, 1993	Building an Integrated Task	X	X	
August 25, 1993	Children's Literature	X		
August 25, 1993	Update On Adolescent Literature		X	
August 25, 1993	Appalachian Students In Chapter 1	X	X	
August 27, 1993	Graphonics in The Whole Language Program	X		
August 31, 1993	Chapter 1 Nonpublic Programs (Orientation)			X
September 2-3, 1993 (two sessions evaluated)	Reading Essentials for Combo Teachers	X		
September 23, 1993	Chapter 1 Reading, Grade 1	X		
September 29-30, 1993 (two sessions evaluated)	Reading Essentials for Combo Teachers	X		

(table continues)

Table A-1 (cont'd)

Dates and Topics of Evaluated Chapter 1 Inservice Meetings
Conducted for Public and Nonpublic Teachers in the
Chapter 1 Reading Program
1993-94

Date	Title of Inservice	Elementary (Grades 1-5)	Middle (Grades 6-8)	Nonpublic (Grades 1-8)
October 1, 1993	New Lessons for Instructional Guide and Student Program Improvement Information			X
November 12, 1993	Instruction in the Chapter 1 Program	X		
November16-30, 1993 (four sessions evaluated)	Teaching for Strategies/ Desired Outcome 1	X		X
November 17-24, 1993 (two sessions evaluated)	Desired Outcome 1/Book Fair		X	
January 22, 1994	Literacy Development for the Primary Child	X		X
February 8, 1994	Scheduling Alternatives/ Motivating Reluctant Students		X	X
March 4, 1994 April 27, 1994 (five sessions evaluated)	Focused Observation/ Integrating Reading and Writing	X		X
March 9, 1994	Observation of a Chapter 1 Classroom		X	
April 18, 1994	Learning Styles and Sharing			X

P:\P502\FRPTRD94
8-29-95 6:53 AM

Table A-2

Minimum, Maximum, and Median Score of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Total Reading Performance Reported by Grade Level 1993-94

Grade	Sample	Pretest			Posttest		
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile
2	830	1	95	8.0	1	90	10.0
3	880	1	60	9.0	1	99	10.0
4	468	1	60	13.0	1	81	15.0
5	410	1	52	12.0	1	96	18.0
6	381	1	56	14.0	1	63	14.0
7	419	1	39	13.0	1	65	18.0
8	320	1	41	12.0	1	56	12.0

Table A-3

Minimum, Maximum, and Median Score of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Reading Comprehension Performance Reported by Grade Level 1993-94

Grade	Sample	Pretest			Posttest		
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile
2	867	1	82	8.0	1	99	13.0
3	898	1	82	13.0	1	99	15.0
4	488	1	63	15.0	1	81	17.0
5	413	1	63	16.0	3	90	21.0
6	383	3	55	17.0	1	83	17.0
7	430	1	63	16.0	2	77	21.0
8	326	2	61	17.0	1	68	15.0

Appendix B

Instruments

CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE
Chapter 1 Reading Program (Grades 2-8)
1993-94

Student Legal Name _____ (Last, First)

Student Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _ (M M D D Y Y)

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code _____ (1-5) Sex _____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Grade Level _ _

Service Index Number _ _ . _

Program Teacher Name _____

Program Code _ _ _ _ _

School _____

School Code _ _ _

1993-94	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	SUB-TOTALS Scheduled (1,2)	SUB-TOTALS Served (2)
Aug. 30 - Sept. 24	M	M	1	2	3	H	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	17	20	21	22	23	24		
(Max. schdl. days=05)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Sept. 27 - Oct. 22	27	28	29	30	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	data	18	19	20	21	22		
(Max. schdl. days=19)															0							
Oct. 25 - Nov. 19	25	26	27	28	29	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	PC		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																				0		
Nov. 22 - Dec. 17	22	23	24	H	N	29	30	1	2	3	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	17		
(Max. schdl. days=18)				0	0																	
Jan. 3 - Jan. 28	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	14	H	18	19	20	21	24	25	26	27	28		
(Max. schdl. days=19)											0											
Jan. 31 - Feb. 25	31	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18	PC	22	23	24	25		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																0						
Feb. 28 - Mar. 25	28	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18	21	22	23	24	25		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Mar. 28 - Apr. 22	28	29	30	31	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	12	13	14	15	18	19	20	21	22		
(Max. schdl. days=14)					0	0	0	0	0	0												
Apr. 25 - May 20	25	26	27	28	29	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	18	17	18	19	20		
(Max. schdl. days=10)											0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
May 23 - June 10	23	24	25	26	27	H	31	1	2	3	6	7	8	9	R	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////////////////////////////	
(No scheduled days)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////////////////////////////	

TOTALS

Scheduled			Served		

(Maximum Scheduled = 143)
(Maximum Served = 143)

SERVICE CODES:

0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, General Fund Service, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class: Field Trips, Assemblies, Time Out, Testing, etc.)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil Scheduled and Present)

RACE/ETHNIC CODES:

1 = Non Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

ALPHABETIC CODES:

(Write codes to LEFT of Date – Not in Service Code Fields)
E = Entered
W = Withdrawn
D = Discontinued

P:\P502\CTCW94

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: Put the letter X on the line to the left of the name of any pupil you served any time this year in this program. Add pupils as necessary.

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

PUPIL ROSTER 1993-94
SORTED BY NAME WITHIN GRADE

PREPARED BY
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT
DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION
(plf rst9425x)

11:21 Wednesday, March 2, 1994

PROGRAM=94004 READING ELEM CH 1 SCHOOL=632 SOUTHWOOD ES SSN=[redacted] TEACHER=[redacted]
(continued)

SERVED (X)	LAST	FIRST	MI	STUDENT NUMBER	GR	BIRTH DATE	RACE	SEX
-	[redacted]	JONATHAN	L	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	JOSHUA	P	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	DANIELL	L	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	STEVE	A	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	TIMOTHY	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	MICHAEL	G	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	M
-	[redacted]	BRITTENY	N	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	ANDRE	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	M
-	[redacted]	DAVID	S	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	JASON	L	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	M
-	[redacted]	ALICE	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	MARONDA	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	CHRISTINA	M	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	JEFFREY	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	ANN	M	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	CHRISTOPHER	J	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	JOHNNY II	E	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	CARLOS	M	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	M
-	[redacted]	ANTHONY JR	J	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	M
-	[redacted]	MONICA		[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	ROBERT	A	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	ASHLEY	N	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	ASHLEY	N	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	DANNY	R	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	MATTHEW	A	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	DELMON	G	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	FAIRBY	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	TAINKA	R	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	LAFFIE	J	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	MEAGAN	M	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	ASHLEY	N	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	JAMIE	M	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]S	JEFFREY	A	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	JEROME JR	M	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	M
-	[redacted]	CHEVELLE	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	ELICE	S	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	ANTHONY	H	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	STEPHEN	C	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	JEREMY	L	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	RONALD II	F	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	TABETHA	S	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	F
-	[redacted]	KATESHIA	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	ROBERT	J	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]S	MARK	D	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	1	M
-	[redacted]	TIFFANY	C	[redacted]	02	[redacted]	2	F
-	[redacted]	JOHN	R	[redacted]	03	[redacted]	1	M

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SHEET

PUPIL DATA SHEET

1 SCHOOL CODE 302 PROGRAM CODE 94004 SSN [redacted]

ALPINE ES READING ELEM CH 1 [redacted]

1. STUDENT NAME [redacted]
2. STUDENT NO [redacted] GRADE 05 BIRTHDATE [redacted]
3. AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK OF INSTRUCTION | | | . | |

4.	PUPIL PROGRESS	NONE	SOME MUCH
5.	IS THIS PUPIL ENGLISH SPEAKING?	NO	YES
6.	WAS THIS PUPIL DISCONTINUED? (CAREFULLY READ GUIDELINES)	NO	YES
7.	GRADE 1 ONLY: WAS THIS PUPIL PREVIOUSLY SERVED IN READING RECOVERY THIS SCHOOL YEAR?	NO	YES
8.	PARENT HELPED WITH HOMEWORK?	NO	YES
9.	PARENT READS TO CHILD OR CHILD READS TO PARENT?	NO	YES

FOR NUMBERS 10-14, FILL IN THE NUMBER OF THIS PUPIL'S PARENTS INVOLVED IN EACH ACTIVITY DURING THE YEAR AND TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACTS.

		NO. OF PARENTS	TOTAL NO. OF CONTACTS
10.	PLANNING		
11.	GROUP MEETINGS		
12.	INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES		
13.	CLASSROOM VISITS		
14.	HOME VISITS		

	THRU 03-18-94	FROM 03-21-94 THRU 05-06-94
15. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE SCHEDULED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)		
16. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE RECEIVED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)		

17. ON AVERAGE, THIS PUPIL WAS SCHEDULED TO RECEIVE SERVICE _____ DAYS OUT OF _____.

18. Grade 1 Only: WHILE IN YOUR CLASS, the Number of Books Read at Text Reading Level Greater than 7 | | | | |

19. Grades 2 - 8 Only: WHILE IN YOUR CLASS, the Number of Books Read as Certified by Chapter 1 Teacher | | | | |

(OVER)

SHEET

PUPIL DATA SHEET

1 SCHOOL CODE 302 PROGRAM CODE 94004 SSN [redacted]

ALPINE ES READING ELEM CH 1 [redacted]

STUDENT NAME [redacted]

STUDENT NO. [redacted] GRADE 05 BIRTHDATE [redacted]

INDICATE THE STRATEGIC PROCESSING BEHAVIORS DISPLAYED BY PUPIL:

20. CONSTRUCTS MEANING	NO	YES
21. MONITORS READING	NO	YES
22. INTEGRATES INFORMATION SOURCES	NO	YES

Prepared by
Office of the Deputy Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(pif pds)

Columbus Public Schools
ESEA Chapter 1 Reading Programs

Collection Form for **READING DESIRED OUTCOME 1**

"Evidence of Strategic Processing"

1993-94

Student Legal Name _____ (Last, First)
Student Birthdate __ __ __ __ __ __ (M M D D Y Y) Grade __ __
Student Number __ __ __ __ __ __

Program Teacher Name _____
Program Code __ __ __ __ __
School _____

RATIONALE AND PROCEDURE: One of the benchmarks for determining whether or not a student is deemed successful as a reader is if the student exhibits behaviors which display strategic processing over a period of time. Three of these behaviors are listed below. The student should be observed over a period of time (the full school year) and will have met this desired outcome if he/she appropriately exhibits each behavior at least once during the observational periods. The program teacher should observe these behaviors multiple times during the treatment period and record the behaviors, when observed, on the form below.

CHECKLIST

DIRECTIONS: Place a "X" (check) in the appropriate space when the behavior is consistently observed.

OUTCOME INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONAL PERIODS		
Behaviors	Sep./Nov.	Dec./Feb.	Apr./May
1. Constructs Meaning			
2. Monitors Reading			
3. Integrates Sources of Information			

*Please share this with the classroom teacher during your conference time. Do not send a copy of this form to the new school when a student transfers to another school. You will need this information to complete each pupil's PDS in the Spring. Also, **please** send a copy of this form to your coordinator at the end of the year.*

P:\P502\READDO1

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

NONPUBLIC END OF YEAR DATA COLLECTION FORM
1993-94

PROGRAM=94104 SCHOOL=780 ST MARY TEACHER=[redacted]
(continued)

LAST	FIRST	MI	STUDENT NUMBER	GRADE	DATE OF BIRTH	RACE	SEX	PROMOTE VALUE (P/F)	FINAL GRADE
[redacted]	RACHEL	N	[redacted]	04	[redacted]	1	F	—	
[redacted]	JOHN		[redacted]	04	[redacted]	4	M	—	
[redacted]	CHRISTOPHER		[redacted]	05	[redacted]	1	M	—	
[redacted]	VINCENT		[redacted]	07	[redacted]	4	M		—
[redacted]	DANIELLE		[redacted]	07	[redacted]	1	F		—
[redacted]	ANN	L	[redacted]	07	[redacted]	1	F		—
[redacted]	JAMES		[redacted]	07	[redacted]	2	M		—
[redacted]	WILLIAM	P	[redacted]	07	[redacted]	1	M		—
[redacted]	AMANDA		[redacted]	08	[redacted]	2	F		—
[redacted]	SEAN		[redacted]	08	[redacted]	1	M		—
[redacted]	MELISSA		[redacted]	08	[redacted]	1	F		—

N = 29

1. If pupil was not served this year, circle the student number.
2. Enter actual grade in Final Grade column.
3. If data is unavailable after call is made, enter a check mark to indicate that caller asked for data.

(plf npeoyfrm)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESEA Chapter 1/DPPF
PUPIL INDEPENDENT READING RECORD SHEET
1993-94

Student Legal Name _____
Last, First

Student Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _
M M D D Y Y

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Grade _ _

Sex _____
(M or F)

Program Teacher Name _____

Program Code _ _ _ _ _

School _____

School Code _ _ _

NAME OF BOOK READ	DATE	GRADE 1 ONLY RUNNING RECORD Level	%	SC	READING INDICATOR (GRADES 2-6) CONFERENCE DISCUSSION	WRITTEN RESPONSE	OTHER (SPECIFY)

YOU WILL REPORT THE NUMBER OF BOOKS READ ON THE PUPIL DATA SHEET IN THE SPRING.

KEEP THIS FORM FOR YOUR RECORDS. PLEASE SEND A COPY OF THIS FORM TO YOUR COORDINATOR AT THE END OF THE YEAR.

35

P:\P502\DO39394

ESEA - Chapter 1
Parent Involvement Log
1993-94

Program Code _____ Last _____ (Name of Pupil) First _____ Grade ____

Parent/Guardian _____ Address _____ Zip _____ Phone Number _____

THE COLLECTION OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT DATA IS REQUIRED BY CHAPTER 1.

Please check if the following two activities occurred for this pupil anytime this year.

☐ Parent helped child with homework
☐ Parent read to child or child read to parent

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate in the fields below the date, activity, and name of parent/guardian. Obviously, you may keep expanded notes about activities somewhere else.

Date MMDDYY	Activity* (1-5)	Attendee(s) Parent/Guardian

*Kinds of Parent Involvement to record for the column labeled Activity

(1) Involved in planning (do not include advisory council)
(2) Group meetings (do not include advisory council)
(3) Individual conferences (telephone conferences included)
(4) Parental classroom visits
(5) Home visits

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1993-94

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____ Date: ___/___/___
mm dd yy

Session Time (Check only one): ___ All Day ___ A.M. ___ P.M. ___ After School

Circle only the program you are in (Circle only one):

(1) Reading-Elementary (1-5)
(2) Reading/Math Combo-Elementary (2-5)
(3) Nonpublic Program (1-8)
(4) Math-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Reading/Math Combo-Middle School (6-8)
(7) Math-Middle School (6-8)
(8) Other (Specify) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-6.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The goals/objectives for this inservice session were met.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The inservice session was very worthwhile.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The information presented in this inservice session will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The information was clearly presented.	5	4	3	2	1
5. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

7. The most valuable part of the inservice was _____
_____
_____

8. I would like additional inservice session(s) on:
_____
_____

9. COMMENTS: _____
_____
_____

P:\P502\FRPTRD94
8-29-95 6:53 AM

ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1993-94

Session Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____ Date: _____

Session Description Code: _____

Session Time (Check only one): ___ 8a.m.-9:50a.m. ___ 10a.m.-12noon ___ 1p.m.-3p.m.

Circle only the program you are in (Circle only one):

(1) Reading-Elementary (1-5)
(2) Reading/Math Combo-Elementary (2-5)
(3) Math-Elementary (3-5)
(4) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(5) Reading/Math Combo-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Math-Middle School (6-8)
(7) Other (Specify) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-6.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The goals/objectives for this session were met.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The inservice session was very worthwhile.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The information presented in this session will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The information was clearly presented.	5	4	3	2	1
5. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

7. The most valuable part of the inservice was _____

_____

_____

8. I would like additional inservice session(s) on:

_____

_____

9. COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

P:\P502\FRPTRD94
8-29-95 6:53 AM